UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

John Haynes Holmes
Editor in Chief

Louis L. Mann
Curtis W. Reese
Associate Editors

Professional Responsibility

By JOSEPH ERNEST McAFEE

Some Church Leaders

By SYDNEY STRONG

Drifting

By EDMUND KIERNAN

Thoughts of Tolstoy

PART X

VOLUME CVI NUMBER 19

Chicago, January 19, 1931

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Weekly *Subscription $3.00*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, October 10, 1930, at the Post office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor in Chief*
EDITH LLOYD JONES, *Managing Editor*

Associate Editors
LOUIS L. MANN CURTIS W. REESE

Board of Directors

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON, Treasurer
MRS. ELLA NAGELEY
MRS. EDITH LLOYD JONES
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

Editorial Board

EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
RAYMOND H. PALMER
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
SYDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
CHARLES E. BEALS
PERCY M. DAWSON
DAVID STARR JORDAN
ANNA GARLIN SPENCER
FREDERICK STARR
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
JAMES H. WEST

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
WALTER WALSH
CANADA—NORMAN STEWART DOWD
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
ITALY—DOROTHY WALTON
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL— Page

Notes 291
Professional Responsibility—JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE..... 293
Jottings—J. H. H..... 295

ARTICLES—

American Notes—Some Church Leaders—VI. SYDNEY STRONG. 295
Drifting—EDMUND KIERNAN 297
Thoughts of Tolstoy—*Part X*..... 299

POETRY—

Refuge—GRANVILLE TRACE 291
Prayer—MADELINE M. STONE..... 303

THE STUDY TABLE—

A Frustrated People—LOUIS I. NEWMAN..... 301

CORRESPONDENCE—

Capitalism and Communism: A Letter from Moscow—
J. F. HECKER..... 302
Jesus and Communism—ERNEST A. NORRIS..... 303

THE FIELD—

An Annual Prize for Religious Service..... 290
Christian Missionaries Support Indian Self-Rule—*Young India*. 304

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

An Annual Prize for Religious Service

The Community Church, Park Avenue and 34th Street, New York City, announces the establishment of an Annual Prize to be given by the church to the man or woman who has made the most notable, beneficent or original contribution to the progress of religion in this country. The prize will consist of a gold medal, to be known as the Community Church Medal, which will be properly inscribed, and which will be presented each year to the winner at a special service at the Community Church.

A board of judges consisting of three members, appointed by the Trustees of the church, will award the prize each year. The judges are Reverend John Haynes Holmes, Minister of the Community Church, Dr. Stephen S. Wise, Rabbi of the Free Synogogue, and Dr. Frank Oliver Hall, Pastor of the Universalist Church of the Divine Paternity.

"The Community Church Medal," said Mr. Holmes, "is intended to signalize creative and idealistic achievements in the religious field which all too often pass unnoticed. More notable things are being done in the churches for human progress and enlightenment, and for the true interpretation and rigorous application of religion, than the public realizes. There are real saints and prophets among us today, and the distinction of these persons should be recognized, as the distinction of authors, playwrights, scientists, and peace makers are recognized.

"What particular achievement may call for recognition in any year, we do not know. It may be the writing of a remarkable book, or the preaching of a courageous sermon, or the establishment of some original program of practical religious service, or some single deed of sacrifice and heroism for the public weal. Theological and ecclesiastical interest will not concern us, but only those larger aspects of the fundamental religion of honest thought and valiant living. It is the hope of the Community Church that the proper bestowal of this Medal each year will help to distinguish true religion from false and thus exert an influence in making plain what religious service in this world really is.

"The Medal will be awarded each year without any regard to personal, creedal or denominational distinctions. Jews and Christians, Negroes and whites, natives and foreigners, believers and unbelievers, will all be eligible to the award. Our only interest is the type of service rendered, and its permanent spiritual value to mankind."

The first award of the Community Church Medal will be for the year 1931. The name of the winner will be announced immediately at the close of the year, and the Medal bestowed at a special service at the Community Church shortly thereafter.

(*Continued on Page* 304)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

VOLUME CVI MONDAY, JANUARY 19, 1931 NUMBER 19

REFUGE

At night, in time long past, before I slept
I chose my dream, which came. I was content
With childish things that memory has not kept.
If now that power which one brief year was lent
Were mine again, I might dream grander things;
Yet not, I think, of wealth or youth or fame
Nor pleasures of the mob and crownless kings—
Distraught, debased and mindless all the same.
My dream would be that men loved truth and beauty,
That glorious girls were formed with inner grace,
That goodly stupid folk might learn that duty
Limps when imagination has no place.
And if in fields of vision I could reap
No sheaves like these, I'd wake and dream of sleep.

GRANVILLE TRACE.

Unemployment is a fact, and a tragic fact. But it is made only more tragic by the attempt of greedy self-seekers to use it as an excuse for getting their hands into the public treasury and running off with public funds. Here are the World War veterans, for example, conspiring with the cheap-jack politicians to grab from a billion to three and a half billion dollars to pay off veterans' endowment insurance certificates which do not fall due until 1945. The veterans to whom it is proposed to vote this aid in government funds are not all unemployed. On the contrary, these veterans are at just the age today which is least likely to be unemployed. The veterans who need relief, as Norman Thomas has well pointed out, "are the veterans in labor's army who cannot find a job. To help these by relief, ultimately to be raised from an income and inheritance tax, is a matter of justice, and a sound emergency measure in a country which has neglected unemployment insurance." But to vote to the youthful war veterans, indiscriminately, hundreds of millions, is to raid the treasury for the benefit of men the majority of whom do not need the money, and in the interest of politicians looking for an easy way of saying, "Look at what we have done for the unemployed!" Another unemployment racket is that engineered by the big navy men to get huge naval appropriations from Congress on the pretext of providing work for the idle. This is the happy day for admirals and statesmen who want to keep useless and expensive navy yards open, and especially to build huge ships of war. But this is madness—to buy employment at the expense of peace! As Benjamin C. Marsh shrewdly stated at a recent public conference in Washington, "If we have to build ships to help the unemployed, let's sink them as soon as they are done to help peace." Money spent on the navy is criminal waste. If we would spend money for work, let us spend it on roads, schools, decent houses for the poor, which are a sure and beneficent investment. Unemployment is terrible, but there is no reason why it should make us lunatics and wastrels.

The recent failure of the Bank of United States in New York—the largest bank failure in the history of the city—opened up something like a new chapter in the history of banking in this country. New possibilities of exploiting the people were revealed in almost startling nakedness. The failure of the Bank was of course a perfectly conventional affair. It was simply the old story of the trusting depositors going to their bank on a certain day and finding the doors locked and their money gone. But on this same day something else occurred which had never occurred before. Simultaneously with the announcement of the closing of the Bank of United States, it was solemnly announced by a large group of other banks that depositors might borrow of these banks up to fifty per cent of their deposits at an interest rate of five per cent. Could anything be more perfectly lovely? Hard-working men and women graciously allowed to have the use of half of their own money which they had entrusted to the bankers, and to enjoy the opportunity of paying five per cent for the privilege! But the utter loveliness of this scheme cannot be appreciated until it is seen from the standpoint of the banks. Here are these mighty financial institutions loaded down with millions of dollars for which they can find no profitable use. In a desperate endeavor to persuade somebody to do some borrowing, the bankers have lowered the rate on "call" money to the lowest figure ever known! Still no loans are made. Then, at the moment when the glut is at its worst, the Bank of United States fails, and millions of dollars are immediately loaned to desperate depositors, on absolutely riskless security, at the handsome rate of five per cent. Well, there's "a new one born every minute," as Barnum said; and a new scheme hatched to rob him. Henceforth, whenever banks need to loan out money on good security and at good interest, we may confi-

dently look for another failure after the style of the Bank of United States.

It would seem as though this were the worst time in the world for a strike. And so it is in most parts of the country! But the South, in its retarded industrial development, is now living in the strike era, and low wages, long hours, intolerable conditions of labor, and stupid employers are bringing the same outbreaks and rebellions that swept the North a generation ago. The latest strike as this editorial is written is in Danville, Virginia, where factory workers have been forced into open warfare in defense of their right to organize. The scene is one familiar in American industrial history—long lines of strikers outside and inside the headquarters where food and other relief is distributed, the great mills guarded by unhappy school-boys in militia uniforms, the rows and rows of mill houses from which evictions have begun under orders from "the boss" who is "a great Christian and teaches a Bible class." This Danville strike is an entirely elementary affair. It involves not a shadow of Communism, but only an attempt on the part of the American Federation of Labor to establish an old-line union of workers. Yet it it being fought bitterly by the employers, backed up by the state, just as though nothing had happened in the labor world in this country during the last forty years. The condition in the South is enormously interesting to any student of American industrial evolution. It is on the one hand woefully familiar, and on the other presents new factors of importance. Norman Thomas has described a recent visit as follows:

> The end of another Southern trip leaves me with mixed impressions. Dreadful unemployment in an industrial city like Birmingham, but little evidence of the Communism which so excited Congressman Fish, a terribly poor countryside (especially in parts of Georgia and Alabama), bad prices for cotton and tobacco, discouraged farmers too numerous to make a living on soil mined of its fertility and scarred by the rains. This poor rural population, white and black, is a reservoir of cheap labor. The plantation psychology still rules, complicated by race prejudice and hallowed by an overdose of emotional, revivalistic, fundamentalist religion which is a dead weight on straight thinking. And yet; fine, keen forums in cities and colleges both white and colored. A genuine and increasing interest in Socialism, and a far greater interest in bringing public utilities to account. Much personal kindness to the Northern visitor.

A revolution in Guatemala, a revolution in Panama, a fresh uprising in Nicaragua with eight dead American marines to tell the story—these are great days in Central America and vicinity! The revolt in Nicaragua is a healthy sign that the people there still hate foreign invaders upon their native soil, and a not unhealthy reminder to this nation that we are still exposing the lives of good American boys in the miserable business of capitalistic imperialism. We confess it makes our blood boil to think of innocent men ordered under arms into a country where they don't belong, and laying down their lives in no better cause than that of protecting the banking and industrial interests of rich men and corporations in the United States. The marines should never have been sent into Nicaragua in the first place. They should not have been kept there all these months and years. They should now be withdrawn immediately and without condition. We join Senator Borah and Senator King in their stalwart opposition to this criminal racketeering on behalf of "big business" seeking the profitable commercial exploitation of poor and helpless peoples in foreign lands. Of course, the marines will not be withdrawn. The usual "bunk" about the flag, and "not retreating under fire," and "the white man's burden," will hold them in Nicaragua until our imperialists have as successful a strangle-hold there as in Cuba. But it's a pity that some of the bankers and politicians responsible for this iniquitous policy cannot do some of the dying in the southern jungles. Marines, however, are hired for this particular work—well paid while they live, and a gorgeous military funeral if they die! Then, too, every death in Nicaragua releases a job in America, and thus helps to relieve the unemployment problem. So it isn't so bad, especially if you are interested in money more than in men, and in markets more than in honor.

There was something fine about old Joffre. One of the most famous and beloved of French soldiers, he fitted no military pattern in France or elsewhere, and was great for quite other than conventionally military reasons. Thus, he met the full impact of the Great War when men knew the least about how to face it, and never for a moment gave way to fear, despair, or even impatience. He conducted a prolonged retreat in the midst of hysterical clamors for advance or resistance in the old French tradition of "la gloire," and yielded as little as a granite cliff yields to the raging surf of an angry sea. He won the greatest battle in the history of modern times, one of the four or five most decisive battles of the world, and remained unspoiled of arrogance or pride. He was conspired against by politicians and fellow-officers, and at last was humiliated and retired into obscurity, and never spoke one word of anger or complaint. He lived to see his generalship derided and his accomplishment denied, and remained silent against attack. Other men might dispute and shout—Clemenceau, Foche, Poincaré might contend for the spoils of victory, but not Joffre! Of his qualities as a commander, we are quite incompetent to judge. Captain Lidell Hart has passed upon them not unfavorably. But of Joffre's qualities as a man, we have no doubt. He was simple, kindly, gentle. He was strong also—so strong under strain as to be heroic. In the hour of disaster, he was composed and unafraid; and in the mounting panic of those early months of the War, he kept his head when all around him were losing theirs. More than any other one thing France needed just the poise and calm, the phlegm, even the in-

difference and sluggish repose, which were embodied in Joffre as in a chosen instrument for his nation's deliverance. It was because Frenchmen instinctively recognized this fact, that they reverenced and loved Joffre, where they only coolly admired Foche. To the end he was the "Papa" who had taken frightened children under his strong protection, and saved them.

It is interesting to read "Pre-War America," the third volume of Mark Sullivan's fascinating work, "Our Times," and note that apart from an extended description of the famous heresy trial of Dr. Crapsey, little is said about churches and ministers. Mr. Sullivan discusses every conceivable phase of life in the United States in the first decade of the century. Politics and business, of course, loom large. Fashions, modes of transportation, architecture, and household conveniences have their places. There are scores of pages devoted to books, plays, magazines, and popular songs. Murders are not forgotten. The last chapters in this work, as in its predecessors, are devoted to a sort of diary-chronicle of all important and many unimportant events during these years. But unless our searching eye has deceived us, there is hardly mention of anything to do with religion! If clergymen are referred to it is in connection with something wholly apart from their distinctive character as churchmen. To read this book, one would never imagine that there was such an institution in America as a church, or such a person as a minister. Yet these were the days of Josiah Strong, Washington Gladden, and Jenkin Lloyd Jones. Edward Everett Hale was a name familiar to the ears of every school-boy. George A. Gordon was preaching to great throngs in Boston, and Minot J. Savage in New York. And Walter Rauschenbusch was creating a revolution in Christian thought by his teachings on religion and the social question. A similar neglect of religion is seen in the *Nation's* "Honor Roll for 1930," which lists politicians, judges, diplomats, educators, journalists, authors, artists, architects, dramatists, actors, and an aviator, as men and women "who have performed some distinguished public service,—made a contribution to art or to literature, or have merely done something interesting," but among them all names not a single clergyman. Was there no minister or rabbi in all the land who did anything important or interesting in 1930? We think it timely that the Community Church of New York has just announced a Gold Medal to be granted each year to the person making the greatest single contribution to the field of religion.

Professional Responsibility

There has been much professional heart-searching of late. There ought to be. There ought to be much more. The past generation has witnessed large access of professional power. The volunteer is thrust aside in every field of social activity, and the professional worker has assumed control. The volunteer reformer is the special scorn of those professions on whose real or assumed prerogative his activity impinges.

Yet the professions have not been so forward to assume responsibility for prevailing conditions within the zones of their prerogatives. They avidly seize power but "pass the buck" when things go wrong. Illustrations of this discrepancy do not fail in the case of any of the professions, either in the old triumvirate of the law, medicine and the ministry, or in the newer independent professions of teaching, social service, engineering, finance and industrial management. In the case of some, social conventions still withhold power, justifying in a degree professional excuses for inefficiency. But most of the professions now lack cogent excuse.

The defects and misdirections of effort in current programs of education are much more plainly "up to" educators than is pleasant for them to contemplate. Some of them indulge in periodic castigations of interfering parents and of muddling or venal legislators, but it is a wholesome sign that educational leaders are roundly scolding themselves in their national and regional conclaves.

The medical profession now commonly employs some of the verbiage of a "positive health" program; many physicians do at least lip service to preventive as over against remedial medicine. But the reputed progressiveness of the medical profession is probably due far more to its vulnerability to attack from outside, than to enlightenment and social vision within the profession itself. The lay health faddist has had much more to do with recent medical reform than it is pleasant for the orthodox profession to admit.

The physician is inclined to look upon the public as his meal ticket, his preserves for livelihood. One hears the plaint from the profession on every quarter that this, that or the other move on the part of the public is "taking the bread out of the doctors' mouths." The recent movement to institutionalize medical service, and standardize fees, is largely instigated outside of the profession and is now accepted by certain members within only because they "see the hand-writing on the wall."

Indeed, all along the line our society is faced by the dilemma of the consolidation of power within the several professions and their increasing resistance to pressure for reform which the public brings to bear from without. How to avoid professional stagnation

and forestall the well-grounded demands of the public for reform is almost our most baffling social problem.

In the field of organized religion the conditions are peculiar. Elsewhere the prerogative of the profession in control is measurably secure; the social need is definite and the public is forced to accept the leadership in charge, or suffer deprivation at a point of conscious and essential need.

On the contrary, in organized religion the revolt against an ineffective leadership takes the form of deliberate abstinence. A large proportion of the public languidly declares, "Oh, what's the use!" when there is demand for religious reform. A growing element has discarded from practical concern the functioning of organized religion. It is easy to stay away from the churches. Beyond an occasional sneering reference to clergymen and their institutions, large numbers of Americans pass from year-end to year-end giving not one thought or sentiment to the program of organized religion. They do not care what happens to the churches or to the profession whose dominance of organized religion is absolute.

A profession thus despised soon comes to despise itself. Desertions from the ministry are numerous. There has been of late an actual and a marked relative reduction in the caliber of the ministerial profession. An intelligence and personality test in one of the leading universities a short time ago showed the ministerial groups registering among the lowest. Faculties in theological seminaries have for several years complained of the relatively inferior quality of ministerial recruits. Such statements, of course, deal with averages and bring no invidious charges where individuals alone are involved.

In any case, the point of present emphasis is the irresponsibility which such tendencies breed. Organized religion is completely dominated by this professional group. Lay movements aiming at reform have proved abortive; latterly they are scarcely attempted. And the dominant profession grows more and more complacent as its personnel weakens, or else the outnumbered progressive element grows more and more timid in attempting reforms manifestly needed.

The fact that a prelate of Bishop Manning's caliber and personality should today occupy the highly potent ecclesiastical throne upon which he seems so immovably seated is ominous. The social irresponsibility of his conduct in the case of Judge Lindsey would be too amazing for belief if it had not actually occurred. Judge Lindsey's conduct is not just now under review. It would be difficult for his most ardent partisans to justify his provocative temper and method. Bishop Manning mounts the pulpit to make his personal attack upon Judge Lindsey in a cathedral for the erection of which he has solicited funds from all elements in the community for a "house of prayer for all peoples." His course is profoundly humiliating to the high-minded clergy of his own communion and subjects them and organized religion as a whole to the jests of the community.

The peculiar significance of professional irresponsibility in this field is no longer the sense of injustice aroused in the community, but rather the spreading habit of getting along without the functioning of organized religion. Thousands of Americans have already accepted the verdict which Lenin caused to have engraved upon the Kremlin, "Religion is the opiate of the people," and have made up their minds to dispense with the dose, as have masses of the Russian people. How serious this is for our civilization is another question which deserves discussion by itself. Present results and the more ominous prospects of the future are, at any rate, an indictment which the ministerial profession will find embarrassment in facing.

Illustrations from the legal profession are flashing up on all sides. With a sagacity which was not at first appreciated the President appointed on his Crime Commission ten lawyers and a woman. The woman has often been commiserated. Many laymen hoped that the President would confine his appointments on that commission to laymen, or at least insure them a majority. It was felt that lawyers had led us into the present slough of crime, and few had faith to believe that they could or at least would lead us out. The President acted upon a sounder social philosophy. The lawyers control the situation. They can and they certainly would block all lay effort to reform legal procedure in suppressing or regulating crime. Having the power there remains only to fix responsibility upon them unequivocally. While results of their efforts through the Crime Commission are certainly not reassuring, yet the principle is sound, and it should be applied even more generally than it has been. If nothing comes of the efforts of the Crime Commission, it will at least be clear who is responsible for the muddle in which the community finds itself.

The scandals revealed in the court investigations in New York are no surprise to the legal profession. Probably no intelligent lawyer in the city has been ignorant of what has been going on. Nor is there likelihood that the revelations will reach to the bottom and the farther margins of the situation, because, as one of the New York lawyers has remarked, the whole legal profession is enmeshed. Only the rawest practices of the raw element will be brought to light.

To a degree the same tendency is apparent here as in the case of the ministry: the community is doing its best to get along without the lawyers. The resort is much more difficult, however, than in the field of organized religion. We are all in the power of the law. However zealously the business man seeks to keep out of court, he is sooner or later forced in. It is significant that the larger corporations are paying lawyers handsomely to keep them out, and often submit to grave

injustice rather than present a just cause to an arbitrament where ways are so devious and issues are so fortuitous.

Indeed, the profession has showed its thrift and ingenuity at no point more markedly than in this turning of the duplicities of the courts to their personal advantage. Far the most lucrative practice of the profession is now found, not in the courts but in keeping clients out of them; the corporation lawyers are the best paid of all, and their skill is largely devoted to the avoidance of court action.

If this does not betoken a kind of connivance with the forces that have perverted the courts of justice, it at any rate, amounts to an indictment of the profession on the grounds of inefficiency. Laymen are powerless to reform legal methods. Attempts on their part to this effect would be resented by the legal profession; nothing would more surely rally lawyers, good and bad, high and low, to a common endeavor than the call to preserve the prerogative of the profession against the attacks of lay outsiders. In no field is the community so helpless in the power of a profession, and in none is inefficiency and perversion of functions more flagrant.

In all cases the community has but one or the other of two recourses. The functions perverted by the delinquent profession may be taken out of its power and transferred to some other newer and more hopeful profession, or the responsibility may be unequivocally and vigorously pressed upon the delinquent profession until it is shamed or otherwise forced into mending its ways. It is difficult for the community to decide which resort is the wiser. It has tried and is trying both with as yet no conclusive success. The former is arousing the doctors to at least modest improvement. With less success the former has also been tried with the lawyers. Now that the President has so openly resorted to the latter method, it may well be pressed all along the line. Shall not the community put crime conditions squarely up to the legal profession? Should not the challenge be pressed until there can be no evasion? Prevalent crime is an indictment of our legal procedure and of the profession responsible both for what it is and for what it is not.

JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE.

Jottings

In view of disparagements of the generalship of the late Marshal Joffre, it may be well to repeat a story which, to our mind, sums up the whole issue of the Marne. According to the tale, a woman friend once asked Joffre who really won the battle of the Marne. To which the marshal calmly replied, "I do not know. I only know who would have lost it if it had been lost"!

UNITY has not reviewed Dr. Axel Munthe's "The Story of San Michele," as it does not lie exactly in the field of this magazine. But if this book is not the most fascinating volume published in 1930, we would like to know the title of its rival.

Mussolini declares that he is "a great admirer of Emerson and William James." H'm! We would like to read some Emerson and James to Mussolini and watch his face. This, for example, from Emerson's "Boston Hymn"—

> Think ye I made this ball
> A field of havoc and war
> Where tyrants great and tyrants small
> Might harry the weak and poor?

There is no guarantee that Englishmen raised to the peerage are men of any note. But when Premier MacDonald raised Ernest Rutherford to the peerage he justified by this one name the House of Lords. For Rutherford rivals Einstein in the sweep and grandeur of his scientific discoveries.

A Cleveland newspaper refers to a distinguished Indian nationalist as "the noted Indian bandit." Undoubtedly the editor meant "pundit," but as undoubtedly also he knows not the difference between the two words.

Inflated Reputations—(5) James Branch Cabell, who was suddenly discovered to be an immortal on the day "Jurgen" was suppressed as an indecent book.

J. H. H.

American Notes

Some Church Leaders—VI

Stephen S. Wise, in his list of "The Ten Church Leaders" in this country, gives a place to Mordecai Johnson, President of Howard University, Washington, D. C. I was watching for my chance to catch him, and it came last night (January 2) when he acted as chairman at the banquet of the American Interracial Seminar, Town Hall, New York City. He was there in all his glory, as chairman and toast-master, as well as key-noter of one of America's gravest problems. He showed himself in various phases.

This meeting was Hubert C. Herring's Seminar on exhibition. It was an intensely interesting story of the journey during twelve days from Washington to Atlanta, and back, in the Pullman car, "Euripides," of thirty-four men and women—nineteen white and fifteen Negro. They stopped in ten centers. They went to

ask the status of the Negro in America, and of his relations with the rest of America. This trip took place in November. All the way they traveled in the same Pullman, the same dining-car, as a band of brothers and sisters—perhaps the first time in history such a thing has been done. They were lawyers, physicians, teachers, business men. They walked in and out of the same passages, "For Colored People." It is a great story—not to be told in this article. Write to Mr. Herring, 112 East 19th Street, New York City, and you can learn of this, and come in contact with one of the most ingenious, inspiring and spiritualizing agencies in the land.

Mine is a short story of Mordecai Johnson. He was the beginning and the close of the meeting. First, he said,

> Mr. Herring's Seminar into the South was living contact supplementing book knowledge. We were to observe and discuss the experiences of a group-contact—a group endowed with many roots and many traditions—it is operated in a place in America where solution of the race problem is most stubborn. This problem involves the life of the nation itself. The issue has been guilty of modifying the U. S. Constitution backward. The welfare of the Negro is not alone involved. All are involved. In the race problem, law-enforcement is involved. Democracy itself is involved. Religion is involved. Divisions in churches grow out of consent of social violence to ten millions of Americans. The foreign relations of America are involved in the race issue. This question, unsettled, stands in the way of our country blazing a way for humanity. Suppose we go to South America with good roads, but import there violent condescension? Dealing with the race question is dealing with the fundamental issue of life.
>
> It is difficult to find out the facts, for we throw our opinions into the facts; and, there is wide diversion of opinions to begin with. We bring with us ready-made theories, and by them interpret the facts. Theories instead must be made to fit the facts. That was the motive behind the trip into the Southland. Whether Americans, North and South, will be able to adjust their theories to fit the facts will determine our progress, or—our retrogression.

So, Mordecai Johnson opened the door for each speaker, one after another. Mr. Corbett of the "Y" describing the need of Christians who "would prefer to meet in catacombs than to dine in Caesar's palace." Mrs. Geo. D. Johnson spoke of the "absence of tragedy in the trip, and everybody had a fine time from start to finish." Mr. Herring, "father of this increasingly creative movement" spoke of the "different brands of complacency. The Seminar method is a study of ourselves, our own attitudes in real situations." Rev. Father La Farge, editor of *America,* also spoke well on the benefit of acting in the interest of our fellowmen as well as of our own—because the interests of all are the same. And while the good Father remarked that the A. F. of L. had been guilty of segregation of the Negro, the chairman was not slow in saying after him, that the "Catholic and Protestant Churches had thrown themselves on the side of segregation. Both these churches are at the parting of the ways! Their recreation or decay hangs on the serious question of the recognition of the Negro." Ira De A. Reed of the National Urban League told of the various groups studying the Negro problem as either altruists, reformers, sentimentalists, or those with selfish interests.

Back and within the whole meeting was the guiding spiritual control of Mordecai Johnson. He was like an expert captain on the bridge. Nothing escaped his eye. Nothing swerved his boat from the goal. Even the gentle breezes of humor helped to carry on the ship, and not to call attention to his smartness—the deadly affection of so many humorists. He is dead in earnest. I have rarely heard a speaker who made me think of the Hebrew prophets as does this "Prophet Mordecai." At times tremendous power of condensation as, for example, in speaking of Gandhi as "a Moses with the method of Jesus" and "non-violence being the principle of social progress." (And I said to myself, Look out, America, here is a man, who, if a crisis comes, may assume the role of a Gandhi—to lead his people, but not his people only, but Anglo-Saxons as well!) Dr. Wise has chosen the right man for one of his "Ten." He is modest—you might say "meek." But, at times, his voice sounds—not for long—like the thunder bolts of Jehovah. And, again, he has a caressing voice (like a singer of the Spirituals) that takes you up in inspiration, and seems like a rainbow shower after a storm.

Of course, he is an excellent administrator, else he would not be the president of Howard University, with its three-score faculty, representative of practically every color and tongue and creed.

Here were his last messages at the banquet. There is need for men who take thought of today, more than yesterday. Living reactions are going on, such as bring about crises. One phase of race relations issued in slavery, and then—a Civil War. In my judgment, the present relations will cost blood international, *if* we do not grasp the facts, and make a plan for handling the situation. It is a race between thought and blood. We are drifting with just enough thought to make us uncomfortable. We need eager, powerful thinking—what this Seminar stands for—a vigorous irresistible program. Our danger is inefficiency in fitting human relations into old formulas. We are afraid to run the risk of changing. We are believing in the doctrine of the Father, without sufficient penetration and program.

As I went away from the Town Hall, having heard the story of the first American Interracial Seminar in the Southland, which presages a new day for human relations in America, I felt I had been made conscious of the "whirlwinds of rebellion sweeping the earth"—but I had seen men and women—about 200 colored and white sitting at meat—who understood the way out, and would bring it to pass. But, it must be *done.* Brother must treat brother as brother, in schools, in churches, in factories, in politics. Nothing short of this will answer. A few cannot do it. It must be universal. As I walked down Broadway, an old story came to mind of a slave race that once broke from bondage, and crossed a desert for many years, but at last came to a land of milk and honey. And, they took the place of the Philistines, who cumbered the earth. Of one thing I am certain. Philistinism—American, British, French—can never endure. We who are Anglo-Saxons would better heed the words of Mordecai, the prophet. Segregation of our brother, the Negro, *must cease—for our own security.* The Negroes, the colored races, have crossed the desert; they are crossing the Jordan. We'll soon hear their horns blowing 'round Jericho. The stars are beginning to take part. The universal life is beginning to make demands on the stewardship of white people. What have you exacted of land, of liberties, of monies, of culture, of friendships, from your brothers? Brothers in brown, black, red. Restore! Fourfold is the divine measure. *Fourfold!* Salvation has this day come to this house! We are in a race with thought and blood, as saith the prophet Mordecai.

SYDNEY STRONG.

Drifting

John Rodman had an organ in his living room. Had it been furnished with less modernity, it might have been considered a throne room. The organ and several gobelins and half a dozen portraits dating from the fifteenth century to the eighteenth were therefore not the only objects suggesting culture in the owner. But the organ indicated creation as well as appreciation. The proof thereof was hearing Rodman play, as I have.

He was the head of a firm whose chief output was white enamel bathroom ware; his business associates did not guess at his unorthodoxy. They merely knew that he did not go to the country club or join them when hip flasks were passed around. He was a reasonably good fellow at other times. When he played, however, he showed his real self.

As I listened to him, I wondered how a man with such practical ability as I knew he had could at the same time have such skill in music. The complementary thought was: "Would Beethoven have been as good at making bathtubs?" I doubted it.

I had met him two weeks before at a Philharmonic concert. He had sat beside me and kept me company in my attempts at tolerance for the cacophony of Schoenberg. That began the friendship. When he had heard some of my views, he invited me to his club. He said he noticed that I seemed to be at peace with myself and he wanted to know the method or the basic ideas. I tried to explain to him and to the four congenial friends he had invited by explaining that I felt myself to be a practical mystic.

Rodman and two of his friends, after I had explained more completely what I meant, thought that I had much too negative an attitude toward life and that I was simply drifting. To that I raised emphatic objection. It was decided, therefore, to hold within a week a symposium at Rodman's house. In the meantime we were to try to get hold of a tramp that we might have his contribution as a drifter of another type.

I found one on the subway on the morning of the day set. He was middle aged but full of self-possession that suffered no shock at my invitation. It required almost eight hours in turkish baths, barber and manicure shops, and the ready-made clothing section of a department store to make him presentable. But then he looked quite the most distinguished member of our gathering.

I am going to tell the rest of this story in dialogue just as it was taken down by the stenographer. The setting was the Rodman library. Mrs. Rodman and my wife were the only women present, except the young one with the pad and pencil.

JOHN RODMAN: My friend, Eric, believes that the best way to live is to find your strongest desires and then follow them. This meeting has been brought together for the purpose of getting a consensus of opinion on the subject.

ERIC KNOOP (quiet spoken young mystic): I must explain that it is more than simply following your desires. It is harmonizing them with your thoughts so that they work together instead of fighting against each other. That is done by finding in yourself the principle of unity, recognizing it as yourself, and allowing it to do the work of harmonization automatically.

JOHN RODMAN: I tell him that is nothing but drifting. You lay yourself open to this principle which comes from somewhere else and it does all the work. In the meantime, as far as I can understand, you disappear—and *I* don't wan't to disappear.

ERIC KNOOP: You have the wrong idea. Until you fully realize that *you* are the harmonizing principle, the thing can't be done properly. It will seem as if it were something outside of you doing the work. But when you know for a certainty what you are, all the rest is comparatively easy.

FRANK HENDERSON (a lawyer with a slender figure and a high forehead): But I think I know what I am. I never thought of myself as a harmonizing principle, I assure you.

ERIC KNOOP: Do you always feel harmonious?

FRANK HENDERSON: Who does?

ERIC KNOOP: If, as a matter of experience, you knew your identity with that principle, you could never feel inharmonious as long as your awareness of it lasted.

JOHN RODMAN: We have a member here of the class that is supposed to drift more than any other. Beasley, what made you take to drifting? What's your history?

RALPH BEASLEY: Dipsomania, if you like long words.

JOHN RODMAN: You talk like an educated man.

RALPH BEASLEY: Princeton, 1907. Learned to drink sophomore year. Turned down all my friends when they tried to help. Went farther downhill every year after my graduation. I was thinking that if anyone had ever given a living definition of drifting, I had. What's your idea of drifting, Rodman?

JOHN RODMAN: There are two kinds, it seems to me. One's your kind, when there's such a strong physical desire present that it can't be resisted. The other is Knoop's kind: not having any kind of a desire except a diffuse sensation of well-being (which is what I understand his usual condition is).

ERIC KNOOP: It's like a boat, isn't it? It's on the ocean and it must get somewhere so that its occupants can get water and food, but the mariner thinks it isn't right to use sails and oars and rudders, and all he will depend on is the ocean currents. That's your idea about my idea, isn't it?

JOHN RODMAN: Quite right!

ERIC KNOOP: Well, I'm in favor of using oars and sails and anything else that will put me where I desire to go.

JOHN RODMAN: But do you use them consciously? You say that when you are in this condition, the principle is harmonizing you. *It* may be working your oars and trimming your sails, but *you* aren't. You are conscious of harmony only and can't pay attention to anything else—if I understand you correctly.

ERIC KNOOP: You've missed the point, which is that one first realizes his identity with the principle. He then feels that he himself is harmonizing his mind and emotions, but with a vastly greater capacity for control. I can fully understand Mr. Henderson's idea of himself as something different from this principle,

but if he ever experiences his identity with it, he will remember and admit the truth of what I've said.

FRANK HENDERSON: You mean I will think that when I return to my ordinary consciousness, don't you?

ERIC KNOOP: Of course!

FRANK HENDERSON: You don't have a feeling, then, of being submerged and as if something else were doing your work for you? That's why I'm afraid of it. I don't want to lose my sense of personal identity. That would be almost as bad as dying.

ERIC KNOOP: I certainly haven't lost my sense of personal identity. I must confess I don't treasure it as I used to.

RALPH BEASLEY: Suppose you'd gone and let a lot of liquor into yourself, like me—what would you do about it? You can't exactly get away from your carcass.

ERIC KNOOP: Your strongest motivation is thirst. Mine is self-expression. Why can't you find your own self-expression—your own basis for it? It is a desire which is strong enough to submerge all the others if you will find it and cultivate it.

RALPH BEASLEY: But why is drifting along the stream of self-expression any different from drifting with the desire for drink?

ERIC KNOOP: They are both drifting in a sense, but the first leads to integration and the second leads to disintegration.

RALPH BEASLEY: Then I am really being forced into it by fear of consequences. If I keep on with my present course, I'll have nothing but suffering as my lot. If I change and follow yours, everything will be perfect. Why, that's pure selfishness and enlightened cowardliness.

ERIC KNOOP: Just a moment! If you desire because of the benefits you are expecting, you'll fail. You must realize with certainty that *you* are the good and then you will begin to express yourself. You'll forget about fears and you'll forget about benefits.

RALPH BEASLEY: But if *I* am the good, I can't progress. I am already perfect.

ERIC KNOOP: That's true from the point of view of the Infinite.

RALPH BEASLEY: Well, from my point of view, I'm so dissatisfied with my imperfections that I want to quit.

ERIC KNOOP: You mean kill yourself?

RALPH BEASLEY: Yes.

ERIC KNOOP: You really feel that will be the best way to settle your problems?

RALPH BEASLEY: The best way I know.

ERIC KNOOP: To me it solves nothing. How can you know what is on the other side of death? How much better to face yourself and make yourself healthy in mind and body! It's chiefly mental attitude, or rather acquiring an all-inclusive attitude.

RALPH BEASLEY: That's for you, but not for me. You can't convert me!

ERIC KNOOP: I'm not trying to convert you.

RALPH BEASLEY: If greatness lies in inconsistency, you are great.

ERIC KNOOP: Perhaps. I'm sure you don't get my point. If you will search deeply within yourself, you will find yourself for the first time, and then you'll want to keep on living and you'll have the courage to. You won't only live because you're afraid to die.

JOHN RODMAN: You two are extreme examples of drifting. But how about us? We haven't found the integrating stream and we aren't victims of the disintegrating alcoholic stream. Why isn't it better to be able to select?

MRS. RODMAN: Yes, Mr. Knoop, that seems to me the least desirable feature of your condition. You seem perfectly helpless. You are no longer your own master.

ERIC KNOOP: On the contrary, I am my master for the first time. I am not dragged out of my course by the distractions of desire and theory. I guide my course true in the light of that which I know is myself.

MRS. KNOOP: Does he look like a helpless automaton?

BELVIDERE BLANEY (a rosy, rotund judge): His best recommendation is the look of freedom and happiness in his eyes.

FRANK JOHNSON (a machinist): I'm a drinker, like Beasley, but I'm also satisfied with it, like him, though I'm not satisfied with myself. Drinking helps me to forget myself. On the other hand, a life like Knoop's would be worse to me than sitting on a cloud in a nightgown and harping.

MRS. RODMAN: But you do find a certain amount of happiness in your life, don't you?

FRANK JOHNSON: Yes, when I'm drunk.

MRS. RODMAN: Well, Mr. Knoop finds happiness in his method of life, but he does not need to depend on alcohol to give it to him.

FRANK JOHNSON: How can I be sure he isn't a fake?

ERIC KNOOP: I probably am a good deal of a fake in many ways, but that isn't important. Don't you feel the truth in what I say as applicable to you?

FRANK JOHNSON: Yes, but I need an object lesson of someone else who is living according to truth.

ERIC KNOOP: That would only help you for a time. You must learn to rely on your own truth and strength.

FRANK HENDERSON: I think I am beginning to get the idea. It takes a good deal of courage. You will have to run counter to many prejudices and customs.

ERIC KNOOP: Not so very much. You will no longer be imagining yourself Frank Henderson when you are functioning in the new way. You will know yourself as something more immense and universal and you will not be afraid for it because it cannot die.

RINALDO RAYMON FORTEZ (Brazilian): I comprehend. It is the thrill of meeting with one's beloved, of smelling the sweetest flowers, of viewing a sunset, of swimming in a sparkling ocean—these combined and even vaster, these made eternal.

ERIC KNOOP: Yes, that expresses it; you must have experienced it. But I want to make clear that there is no sentiment because there is perfect detachment.

VICTOR WEITKOPF (a Berlin German): The only trouble I see with this idea is that it can't be made comprehensible. Not one of my philosophical friends could conscientiously write a book on it. That doesn't mean they wouldn't try. But there's nothing to grasp hold of with the mind.

ERIC KNOOP: That's the beauty of it! It can't be explained intellectually and yet it can be made the

most important thing in one's life. It tends to disprove the intellect as the court of final appeal.

JONAS BAKEWELL (a Baptist): But what does it put as the court of final appeal?

ERIC KNOOP: One's own sense of truth.

JONAS BAKEWELL: That's impossible. How can we tell evil from good? We must go back to the Bible to know what is right and wrong. That is the only way to decide as the Lord would have it decided.

RALPH BEASLEY: How would you teach a racketeer to follow his sense of truth?

ERIC KNOOP: I'd have to try to make him realize he wanted to.

RALPH BEASLEY: And then, after he'd wanted to hard enough, you wouldn't need to do much teaching?

ERIC KNOOP: That's right.

RALPH BEASLEY: Blamed if I'm not beginning to want to!

ERIC KNOOP: If you live in the want and get behind it, if you see what I mean, finding what's at the root of it, you won't discover it hard to change your habits.

JOHN RODMAN: It's easy for Beasley because he's been miserable—but how about Edna and me? We're pretty well satisfied with our life; have plenty of money and get on well together.

ERIC KNOOP: Why are you interested in this subject? Why did all these friends of yours come here to listen?

JOHN RODMAN: Mostly curiosity, I suppose.

ERIC KNOOP: Maybe some of that, but I think the main thing is that you're all dissatisfied fundamentally and are looking for some way of finding satisfaction (the real kind, I mean) and happiness.

FRANK HENDERSON: But all mankind is like that.

ERIC KNOOP: And nearly all believe it can be found only in material things. If they seek long enough for it there, they will find complete boredom and that will force them back upon themselves. Why not forestall that by discovering the real desire first? Not to save oneself a great deal of misery, not because someone else tells you it is your duty, but because you realize, after honest self-anaylsis, that it is the most natural thing to do and that it is your deepest desire which you are responding to.

STENOGRAPHER: Pardon me for interrupting, but if no one is going to tell you what's right and what's wrong, I don't see why immorality won't become universal.

JOHN RODMAN: Isn't it almost universal now? I agree with Knoop that trying to keep desire within bounds by means of arbitrary regulations is like trying to dam a river when what is really needed is changing its course.

STENOGRAPHER: I wouldn't like to go with boys if I knew they had no morals.

ERIC KNOOP: You seem to think people are bad if left to themselves.

STENOGRAPHER: Most of the ones I've known were.

ERIC KNOOP: Did you ever stop to think that they tend to be constantly reminded of their badness if they have a set of moral straight-jackets suspended in front of them. I'm convinced that trusting, particularly trusting in yourself, can bring nothing but good.

STENOGRAPHER: You gotta show me!

ERIC KNOOP: No, you must show yourself! You are the only one who can do it. If you don't want to try it, I can do nothing.

BELVIDERE BLANEY: How are we to know that we aren't already doing what you suggest? Why couldn't we have been doing it unconsciously and naturally?

ERIC KNOOP: It happens when we are natural and unconscious of ourselves. It brings us temporary happiness. But then sadness comes with disharmony and we don't understand why. It is a matter of constant effort to keep free of dust the mirror of truth within us so that it will always respond to truth.

JOHN RODMAN: It is time to close. As a matter of curiosity I want to know how many think Knoop's way of life is drifting.

BELVIDERE BLANEY: I'm inclined to agree with the Bible that the best way of expressing it is saying it is founded on solid rock. I've experienced it.

Those who had not experienced it felt that it was drifting but of a much higher type than any other, probably. All wanted to experience it, but felt it impossible. That feeling was the chief thing that kept them from it, Knoop explained, for natural self-expression was only difficult for a thoroughly artificial human being. EDMUND KIERNAN.

Thoughts of Tolstoy

[*Selections from Tolstoy's "Readings for Every Day" here published for the first time in English*]

XXXII

1

There are many different faiths, but in all faiths the teaching of how men must live is one and the same. Now this which is one and the same is the law of God.

2

If a man believes that God can be pleased by rituals and prayers instead of deeds, it means that he wants to deceive God but is only deceiving himself.

3

The assertion that you are in falsehood and I am in the truth is the cruelest word that one man can say to another, especially when this concerns the most important thing in the world. And yet men say this very thing in disputing about religion.

4

Diversity of religions—what a strange expression! Of course, there can be various beliefs in historical events, passed on from generation to generation for the strengthening of religion. And, just so, there can be various religious books (the Zendavesta, the Vedas, the Koran, the Gospel and so forth). But there can be only one *religion,* valid for all times. And all the various faiths can only be comprised of preparations for the true religion; preparations that appear casually and may vary to suit various times and places. (*Kant*).

XXXIII

1

Man only knows himself when he knows that his life is not in the body but in the spirit.

2

For a man who believes that life does not begin with birth and will not end with death, it is easier to lead a good life, than it is for a man who neither understands nor believes this.

3

Man learns that he will never die, only when he understands that he was never born.

4

Spiritual being—God—cannot be limited, cannot be a part. But the consciousness of this spiritual being can be limited; and this limited consciousness of spiritual being is man.

5

Man feels his freedom insomuch as he transfers his life from carnal to spiritual existence.

6

As soon as you feel passionate desire,—call up in yourself the consciousness of your spirituality. As soon as you feel that your divinity is being obscured,—know that passions have taken possession of you and struggle with them.

7

Man can transfer the "self" from the sphere of the subordinate, the inconstant and the miserable to that which is free, unchanging and joyous,—to the consciousness of his spritual nature.

XXXIV

1

We feel that the all-important thing by which we live and which we call our real self, is just the same not only in every man, but in a dog, a horse, a mouse, a hen, a bee, a sparrow, and even in a tree.

2

There was a time when all men ate human flesh and saw nothing wrong in this. Then the best people understood that it was wrong. And little by little men lost the habit of eating human flesh, until now they are so unaccustomed to it, that it is dreadful for them to think of eating their brothers. In the same way many people even now understand that it is wrong to eat animals; and there begin to be more and more such people. The time will soon come when it will be just as dreadful to think of killing a sheep, an ox or a pig to eat it, as it now seems to think of killing a man to eat him.

3

All beings, both men and animals, are so bound up with each other that when one suffers, these sufferings are in some way or another, either at once or long afterwards, transmitted to all. And just so the felicity of every separate being is bound up with all, and in one way or another is transmitted to all.

4

If a man thinks that his life is in his personality, and if he lives only for himself, he inevitably suffers. Once he understands that what he lives by is the same in all men, not only is his suffering alleviated, but he comes to know the highest felicity in the world: love toward men, and their love toward him.

XXXV

1

Everyone can feel God, but no one can know him. Therefore do not try to know him, but try to feel him in yourself, ever more and more vividly.

2

You can only know God in yourself. Until you find him in yourself, you will not find him anywhere.

3

Seek not God in temples. He is near thee, he is within thee. He dwells in thee. Do but give thyself up to him, and thou shalt rise above good and evil fortune.

4

God dwells in every kind-hearted man.

5

Someone is doing a certain work of his own through this life of the world, and through our lives. He who does this is what we call God.

XXXVI

1

My body separates me from others. The soul unites because it is one and the same in all.

2

Every one knows that he must keep from doing whatever disunites people, and must do all that unites him with them. He knows this, not because it was ordered him by someone; but because the more he unites with men, the easier his life is; and, on the contrary, the more he becomes separated from them, the harder it is.

3

While a man is leading an animal life, it seems natural to him that he is separated from all men by the body. It seems to him that this could not be otherwise. But as soon as he begins to live spiritually, it seems strange, even incomprehensible to him; and he is involuntarily drawn toward unity not only with all men, but with all living things.

4

When man puts his life in the body, it seems that "self" is the only thing in the world.

Only my "self" exists, everything is for "me," all except "me" is of no account.

The only important thing in the world is this "self" of mine, and it cannot imagine life without itself and wants to live for ever. And yet reason tells this very "self": in the first place that it, the "self," is not alone, but there are millions upon millions of such "selves," which also consider only themselves important; and that for his own "self" to obtain all that it wants, he must struggle with all these "selves"; and that since he is but one, while there are countless numbers of these "selves" constantly being born, he will inevitably be defeated. And in the second place, reason tells him that he will never obtain all that the "self" wants, because "self" is never satisfied; and no matter what you give, it needs more and more, without end. In the third place, reason tells him that this precious "self" of his, which wants to live for ever, must certainly (and probably very soon) die and vanish away. There is only one way out of this contradiction: to recognize a "self" which needs not strife, but only unity with that same spirit which dwells in it (and this unity is always possible through love); to recognize a "self" for which there is no death.

5

The body wants felicity only for itself, even to the

detriment of the soul; the soul wants felicity for itself, even to the detriment of the body. This strife is only done away with when man understands that his life is not in that which moves, which is destroyed and dies; that it is not in his body, but in the soul; and that the body is only the material over which his soul must labor.

6

In every man there constantly dwell, as it were, two masters: the body and spirit. At first the body predominates; and then strife with other beings and enmity, malevolence toward them are inevitable. But the longer a man lives, the more power passes over to the spirit; and the more power passes over to the spirit, the more this spirit strives toward unity with the same spiritual essence in other beings, instead of enmity toward them.

7

The main difference between what the body wants and what the soul wants is that to indulge the body divides men, while to serve the soul unites them.

(To be Continued)

The Study Table

A Frustrated People

"The Great Betrayal"* by Rabbi Stephen S. Wise of the Free Synagogue, and Jacob de Haas, a veteran in the Zionist movement and biographer of Theodore Herzl and Justice Louis D. Brandeis, is a graphic story of the tragedy which has overtaken the Jewish people in its relationship with the empire of Great Britain. Anyone who desires a vigorous and well-documented statement of the case of *Israel versus Great Britain* regarding the future of Palestine will find "The Great Betrayal" indispensable. Though written in a mood of great indignation and prepared with unusual speed for the press immediately following the publication of the Passfield White Paper on October 20th, the volume is the outgrowth of long study and frequent public utterance on the same theme. Rabbi Wise has spoken against Britain's policy on numerous occasions at Zionist Congresses, despite the unwillingness of his confreres to give ear. Mr. de Haas, though not an official of the Zionist Organization of America from the time of the unhappy Cleveland Convention in 1921 until the Cleveland Convention in 1929, has written far-sighted articles warning Jewry of the increasing hostility of the Mandatory Power towards the Zionist enterprise. "The Great Betrayal" is, therefore, an eloquent epitome of a situation which has been brewing for more than a decade and which has now reached the stage of explosiveness.

Rabbi Wise and Mr. de Haas have proved their point against Great Britain. His Majesty's Government made a compact with Jewry when it needed Jewish support to help win the World War. Today this covenant has been brazenly repudiated, not by a government accustomed to the chicanery of international diplomacy, but a Labor Government, headed by a Prime Minister who, only a few years ago, visited Palestine and spoke eloquently of Jewish achievements in the Holy Land. But what avails it that Jewry's case is proved just? Roumania gave its Jewish citizens legal rights after the Treaty of Berlin in 1878, but they remain "paper rights" to this day. The Versailles Treaty in 1919 established "minority rights" for the Jewish communities of Poland and other East European countries, but they are honored today in the breach rather than the observance. Jews have rights, but they are told by the majority governments: "We dare you to come and take them." In the same way, Jewry may have rights in the sight of Great Britain, but these cannot be enforced. The mouse once rescued the lion, and the cackling geese once saved Rome. Jewry can lift its voice in lament at Madison Square Garden and in a hundred other cities of the globe, but Downing Street and the Colonial Administration in Palestine shrug shoulders and quote Hamlet on excessive protesting. Ramsay MacDonald speaks "weasel words." The Jewish Laborites spike their own verbal guns because Passfield was once Sidney Webb, a Socialist hero. The Jewish Agency collapses like a house of cards. The financial crisis in America leaves the Zionist Organization almost prostrate. Rabbi Wise is forced to withdraw from active service for a long rest. Chaim Weizmann, World Zionist and Agency leader, is virtually discredited because of his decade-long vacillation. Lord Melchett falls ill and dies, following Louis Marshall to the grave when Jewry most needs him. Thus Great Britain's policy sends forth a blight upon a movement which Lord Robert Cecil placed by the side of the League of Nations as an outstanding benefit of the World War.

"The Great Betrayal" makes it evident that Great Britain issued the Balfour Declaration only after mature deliberation and with full cognizance of its commitments. Step by step Rabbi Wise and Mr. de Haas describe the descent to Avernus. At the end of their indictment they say: "we rest our case, confident of the verdict of the conscience of mankind." But is not even humanity's conscience a quicksand rather than a firm foundation for a "safe abode"? "The Great Betrayal" vindicates Jewish policy regarding the Arab people, and italicizes Lord Balfour's remarks in 1920, expressing the hope that they will not "grudge that small niche in what are now Arab territories being given to the people who for all these hundreds of years have been separated from it." A concordat between Jewry and the Arabs is now being advocated. But will Great Britain, suspecting antipathy to her interests, permit it? Already her officials have broken up Arab-Jewish gatherings under the specious charge of Bolshevism. Will the Arabs themselves, hailing the execrable White Paper as the basis of negotiations, accept Jewish negotiations, looking to "organic cooperation" in economic, industrial, agricultural and allied matters? Great Britain's presence in Palestine has increasingly confounded an already confused situation. But the time for her retirement has not yet come. Unless a wise adjustment between the majority Arabs and the minority populations is achieved, it may well be that the Moslem fanatics will seek to drive the Zionist colonists into the sea, or massacre those who courageously defend their firesides and possessions.

These are parlous days in Palestine. "The Great Betrayal" is living testimony to the great wrong perpetrated by a mighty imperial power against a weak and

*"The Great Betrayal," by Rabbi Stephen S. Wise and Jacob de Haas. Brentano's, New York, 1930. $2.00.

scattered people. In the meantime, Jews turn to the Western nations and ask them to lend sympathetic understanding and aid in the hour of peril. Non-Jews may wonder why their Jewish friends will not surrender the Zionist undertaking, or abate one jot or tittle their struggles on behalf of national redemption. It is because, in the words of Josiah Wedgewood, Palestine "is the symbol of Jewish self-respect." It is because Palestine also is a symbol of hope and future for seven million East European Jews, to whom the Wilsonian doctrine of self-determination must be applied as much as to 650,000 Arabs in the Holy Land. It is because Jewish life in the Dispersion is morbid, unnatural and abnormal, without the prospect of a significant Jewish center in Palestine. It is because Jewry, recalling that the First Hebrew Commonwealth gave the Old Testament, and the Second Hebrew Commonwealth, the New Testament to mankind, has highly resolved that a third testament shall go forth from Zion, speedily and in our days. Zionism spells a "national revival" for Israel, but ours is a "prophetic nationalism." It speaks not of armies and navies, nor of aggrandizement and exploitation. It speaks in the language of Zechariah and Jeremiah; it holds forth the vision of Isaiah and Herzl.

(Rabbi) Louis I. Newman.

Correspondence

Capitalism and Communism: A Letter from Moscow

Editor of Unity:

Mr. Edmund B. Chaffee's article on "Capitalism and Communism; Brothers Under the Skin," seems to have for its purpose to save "the Christ spirit" for our civilization by discrediting Communism and making it a "brother under the skin" of capitalism.

I am also one of those who has toiled and struggled all this conscious life to make the Christ spirit real in our civilization. Like most religious minded men I have tried to do this within the bosom of the church. Over a decade ago, however, I became fully convinced that it is impossible to serve both the Church of Christ and the capitalists. I discovered that it is impossible to do the one thing without the other in a capitalist civilization. When I tried it, and openly said that I had lost my faith in capitalism, I was politely asked to resign my position in the religious organization which had engaged me. This convinced me that 99 per cent of the ministers and other religious workers of the Church of Christ had to be loyal to capitalism or lose their jobs. I decided to try whether there are no better chances of realizing the Christ spirit in the land of the Soviets which has set for its goal to replace capitalism by Communism. Now, after almost a decade of life and work among Communists, it may interest Mr. Chaffee and the readers of Unity, to know what likenesses and differences I have found between the two types of civilization—the capitalist and the Communist now struggling for hegemony in the world.

First, I found that Communism is much more honest than capitalism. If it believes in the machine, in dictatorship, monopoly, force, it frankly says so, and does not hypocritically camouflage the issue by championing "democracy," "humanity," "patriotism," "pacifism," "home" and "church," and similar terms under which capitalism likes to hide its dragon teeth.

Secondly, I found that Communists, like the capitalists, have profound trust in organization and the machine. However, they greatly differ as to the purpose these should serve. Whereas capitalism recognizes only the profit motive. Communism knows nothing of that, and emphasizes exclusively the service motive, by teaching and practicing that real happiness can be attained only in the commonwealth of a classless society. It uses the machine and organization to emancipate the millions of toilers of every category from the miseries of poverty and ignorance, and provides the necessary leisure to facilitate education and the cultured life. It has sanctified, for this purpose, work, and considers it the modern savior of mankind, insisting, like St. Paul, "if any will not work, neither let him eat."

Thirdly, Communists believe in the open dictatorship of the proletariat, and not in the hidden dictatorship of corporation presidents. They believe in dictatorship, not as the goal but as the means to attain real democracy—economic, political and social. They justly call it the dictatorship of the proletariat, of which the Communist Party is but the advance guard, and is recruited from the ranks of the workers, and subject to the control of the masses. All responsible positions are commonly held by workers who may or may not be members of the party. If bank and corporation boards with their presidents should be chosen also, in the capitalist world, from the ranks of the workers, and should receive a salary approximating that of a skilled worker in a factory, as is the case in the U.S.S.R., Mr. Chaffee could justly talk of the capitalists and Communists being "brothers under the skin." But as long as capitalist captains of industry separate themselves into a class of highly paid executives who have nothing in common with the workers, to talk of their being "brothers" of the Communists is grossly misleading.

Fourthly, capitalism and Communism, says Mr. Chaffee, both believe in the use of violence. Yes, Communists make no excuses about it; they know that, in a class-split world, violence is the law of life, and yet there is a vast difference between capitalist and Communist violence. This has been best demonstrated in the so-called disarmament conferences at Geneva in recent years. Does not Mr. Chaffee know that the Communists were the only ones to advocate a complete scrapping of the weapons of violence, and does he not know why the capitalist nations opposed this or any other scheme of limitation of armament? I wish to remind him that Communists favor disarmament because this would help them to gain their ends without violence; for should armaments be scrapped, the capitalist world could no longer hold down its imperialist conquests, nor could it control its enslaved proletarians. This is the reason why they need their armies and navies. Besides this is also corroborated by the fact that the capitalist world is much more afraid of Communist propaganda than of the Communist Red army and navy. Thus the truth of Communism is much more powerful than its weapons of violence, which exist only to protect the Soviet Union from another invasion by its capitalist neighbors.

Finally, both capitalism and Communism, says Mr, Chaffee, are materialistic. Here, it would seem, is a strong point in his favor. But has Mr. Chaffee ever considered what Communist materialism really means, and why they call themselves materialists? It is chiefly because the capitalists love to call themselves idealists, which of course we know they are not. If they had called themselves materialists, I am quite sure the Communists would have abstained from using this term. Communist materialism has nothing in common with the vulgar, mechanistic materialism of capitalism. Philosophically Communist materialism is a synthesis of Spinoza's teaching of "substance" with its attributes of extension and mind, which he also called "God" or "nature", and the dialectics of Hegel, which emphasize the fact that the world is a process governed by certain laws, in which every stage of development is but a stepping stone to the next to come. Thus feudalism and slavery were necessary antecedents to capitalism; capitalism is an antecedent to Socialism; Socialism to Communism; Communism to Anarchism, and so on. Communists call themselves "materialists" to distinguish themselves from the bourgeois philosophic idealists who deny a real objective world, existing independent and outside of consciousness; but spiritually and ethically the Communists do not hold to the implications common to vulgar materialism which makes a bank account and the belly, God.

But, Mr. Chaffee may still object, that the Communists deny God and persecute the church. Yes, they ruthlessly expose all religious fraud, and the church as an agency of capitalism. But they strive for a true spiritual life which finds its joy in community life and in all that is beautiful, good and just. I would suggest that Mr.

Chaffee read some of the Communist classics on religion. I will quote only from the humble tanner, Joseph Dietsgen, a friend and contemporary of Karl Marx, and honored as a proletarian philosopher. He died April 17, 1888, and lies buried in Chicago alongside of the anarchists whom he defended, and whom capitalist "justice" murdered in 1886.

In his essays on the Religion of Social Democracy, he says: "The tendencies of social democracy contain the substance for a new religion . . . God, that is, the good, the beautiful, the holy, must become man, must descend from heaven to earth. However, not as once before, in a religious and miraculous manner, but in a natural earthly way. We ask for a savior; we ask that our Gospel, the word of God, become flesh. However, not in an individual, not in a fixed person, should it be incarnated, but all of us want, the people want, to be the Son of God.

"Religion was until now a matter of the proletariat. Now, on the contrary, the cause of the proletariat, begins to become religious. . . . According to the old revelation, the law was the first, the highest, the eternal, and man the second. According to the new revelation, man is the first, the highest, the eternal, and his law secondary, temporary and alterable. . . . All (religions) strive to redeem suffering humanity from its earthly woes, and to lead it on to the good, the beautiful, the just, the divine. Yes, social democracy is, in so far, the true religion, the only saving church.

"Conscious, planned organization of socialized work is called the hoped-for savior of modern times. . . .The true original sin from which the human race has suffered until now is selfishness. . . . Human development, for us, means the subjection of nature. In this great cause, religion, art, science and morals are but helpers. . . . For the good of our race, the constant development of morals is just as necessary as the nourishment of the body."

This does not sound very materialistic, as Mr. Chaffee understands the term. Joseph Dietsgen, long-forgotten in the west, is now translated into Russian by the Communists, who thus show their solidarity with his views.

The things which seem common to Mr. Chaffee in capitalism and Communism are chiefly due to the dialectic process in which capitalism is an antecedent to Communism, and, in which the achievements of capitalism, its machines and its organization, is raised to a higher power and place in the service of the many. Hegel called this process the negation of negation. Communism has the future, not because I would like to have it, or Mr. Chaffee dislikes to have it, but because it is the next step in the inalterable dialectic process of history, and this step, I believe, is also a step toward making the world fitter for the reign of the spirit of Christ.

J. F. Hecker.

Moscow, Russia.

Jesus and Communism

Was not Jesus the greatest Communist who ever lived? Then, according to Mr. Chaffee (see issue of Unity, December 1, 1930) he must have been a "Brother Under the Skin" to the capitalist. "The driving the money changers out of the Temple should demonstrate this relationship," according to the above writer; just as he equates capitalism with Communism. "Both the capitalist and the Communist rely upon the machine to solve the economic problems of the race." While this is true regarding the *economic* problems of them both, it is the only real comparison that Mr. Chaffee has made. The social problem, which is the main problem, has not been touched.

Is machinery a bare thing in itself, or is it the use that is made of it which makes it either good or bad? It is not improbable that if Jesus had lived in this inventive age, he would have been a great advocate of machinery, as he would have been able to see its labor saving advantages when applied to the right use; it would save the excessive labor of those for whom he lived and died. It seems to be the difference in the use to which machinery is applied that is the economic difference between capitalism and Communism. Mr. Chaffee is quite blind to this important particular. Is it true that capitalism relies upon the machine to solve the *economic* problem? It has always been supposed that their one sole problem was the getting rich quick from the products of those who create the wealth—the workers of the world.

The Great Communist advised, in effect, to "give back what you have filched from the poor, take up your cross and follow me into the highways and the byways, and relieve the hungry and the lame, the sick and the blind." Present Communism seems to be trying to do just that. But all the Christian capitalistic world, which brought about the greatest human slaughter in the whole historical period, and destroyed human products, for individual greed, is now getting ready to join hands to crush Communism out of existence, according to last accounts. They have already tried to crush Communism by means of arms, of systematical lying, and now they seem to have recourse to bribing the officials to break up an experiment for better human conditions in one of the largest nations in the world. But Mr. Chaffee is blind to this, and so advances that vague generalization that capitalism and Communism are "brothers under the skin," while the sole intention of the one is to pile up the wealth of a nation into the hands of a few, while the other is to distribute this wealth to the rightful owners of that wealth; while they both think that can best be done for either side, by increased machinery, or labor-saving appliances. The main matter in economics, which Mr. Chaffee has not mentioned in his attempt at comparison, is the *distribution* of human products.

"The ancient rule.
The good old plan.
That he should take who has the power, and
He should keep who can."

This seems still to be the policy of one of these *"Brothers"* although they translate it in a more prosaic way *now* as "Every one for himself, and the devil take the hindmost." While the other, according to the Dickory means, "common possession and enjoyment," which economically means equal *distribution.* The only way Mr. Chaffee makes these two opposites "brothers under the skin" is by drawing wrong inferences and conclusions.

He advances some vagaries regarding dictatorship. The world has always been run by a very few, only for the most part they have been ignorant, brutal, selfish tyrants. But now when a few "dictators" are trying an experiment in a more humanistic way, the whole Christian world is howling for their crucifixion. Having tried armaments, lying, bribing and so forth, with little or no effect.

Mr. Chaffee proposes to straighten out these difficulties "by the spirit which we call today the 'Christ Spirit.'" Where was the "Christ Spirit" when the greatest human slaughter of the flower of humanity took place in the world? Was it the "Christ Spirit" that burned their fellow Christians for mere differences in creedal opinion? And racked and burned scientists and philosophers for making known their valuable discoveries to mankind? This "Christ Spirit," which it is assumed to have been in existence for nineteen hundred and thirty years—what has it benefited human life? The spirit that is needed is the spirit of manhood, the spirit of courage to tell the truth to humanity, and to die for it if necessary. This would be in line with that great spirit, the founder of Christianity.

Ernest A. Norris.

Los Angeles, California.

Prayer

"And he hath given men skill, that he might be honored in his marvelous works."—Apocrypha, Ecclesiasticus 38, 6 v.

The baker paused and shook his puzzled head:
"Why no, I don't! For many a weary day—
I am too busy; no, I never pray.
My job in life, you see, is making bread;
I try to earn my living, and," he said,
"I give good measure to the loaf, and pay
My workmen well for every honest day—
But I'm too tired to pray, when once in bed.

Perhaps some kindly act will count for me,
The stolen loaf I said I did not see,
The windows built to give my workmen air—
I try to think in this unspoken way
The soul of me does speak—and even pray,
And that God listens to each unsaid prayer."

Madeline M. Stone

The Field

(*Continued from Page* 290)

Christian Missionaries Support Indian Self-Rule

[The march of nationalism in India has been so successful and Indian life has been so stirred by Gandhi's battle for freedom, that even the Christian missionaries, who are the compatriots of the British ruling class, and stay in that country under an oath of "neutrality," have been compelled to take their stand on the principle of India's right to determine her own destiny.

A manifesto signed by over 200 British missionary workers, who rank all the way from medical nurses to the bishops, and belong to the Church of England, and the Church of Scotland and Baptist Wesleyan, Congregational and other Societies, affirms in unmincing language that India has now come of age, and should have the freedom of ruling herself. This manifesto also bears testimony to the universal character of the Indian national demand, for asserting which hundreds of Congressmen have been shot and killed, thousands imprisoned and tens of thousands beaten and maimed.

We take pleasure in presenting the full text of this manifesto, and invite the Christians of this country to scan its words carefully, and decide for themselves whether the plea for Indian liberty, as voiced by the messengers of Christ, deserves their full and frank response. If British Missionaries have found it their duty to support Indian struggle for self determination, should not the Americans at least do that much? In the measure of their response to this manifesto lies the test of their loyalty to Christ and American ideals.—Ed.]

"We, men and women of British nationality, who are working in India in connection with various missionary societies, feel that it is our duty as Christian people to make a statement regarding the present political situation, which we hope will be of some help to our brethren in the West.

"We are not politicians, and we realize that party politics as such lie outside our sphere; but we feel that the present movement is more than political. It touches the springs of personal and national life, and as Christian men and women we feel that we cannot remain silent in regard to issues which have caused such widespread and deep disturbance in the lives of men.

"We have to face a situation that is marked by misunderstanding, distrust and bitterness. We recognize that many explanations may be advanced to account for this, but we would record our conviction that the main cause is to be found in the growing sense of ignominy in the minds of Indian people that the destiny of the nation lies in the hands of another people.

"To us the national awakening is a very real thing, and it is our belief that no settlement will be satisfactory that does not respect Indian sentiment and make for the recovery of national self-respect.

"India is now of age and can speak for herself. We, therefore, urge that the principle should be fully and frankly recognized that the determining factor in laying down the lines of India's future constitution should be the wishes of the people of India.

"This principle is held by politicians of all schools, and it is one that accords with our deepest Christian convictions. Its acceptance by the suzerain power would go far to ensnare the success of the Round Table Conference.

"We are fully aware of the complexity of the problems connected with the future Government of India, and in particular we are sensible that the acceptance of the principle we have urged may give rise to grave anxiety in the minds of many regarding the position of the minority communities in India. But we feel that in this matter Indian leadership must be trusted.

"During the past months, when emotion has so largely taken the place of constructive thinking, we have been doing what we could to strengthen the hands of all who were striving for peace, and we will continue to do so. For we feel that for an adequate and final solution of the political problems, which are in themselves sufficiently difficult, there must be a wide diffusion of a more Christian spirit of good will, and a restoration of mutual respect and trust.

"We, as a Christian people, must be ready to show the forbearance, faith and Christian love which are prepared to take risks for the establishment of this spirit of friendship and good will.

"We look forward with deep and prayerful interest to the Round Table Conference and we regard it as a good omen that it will be opened by the King-Emperor. We have every confidence that the Indian representatives will give clear and convincing expression to the prevailing mind of the country, and we are equally confident that they will receive a fair and friendly hearing. It is our earnest hope that the Conference will lead to a just and lasting settlement, and that the Indian and British peoples may go forward in an honorable partnership which will be for the highest good of both."

Young India (New York)

HERESY: Bishop Brown's Quarterly Lectures for 1930, now complete. Subjects: I The American Race Problem; II The Pope's Crusade Against the Soviet Union; III The Science of Moscow and the Superstition of Rome; IV The Godly Bishops and the Godless Bolsheviks. 10 cents per copy and 25 cents for a full set. Free to radical organizations for sale at meetings and to unemployed workers.

THE BRADFORD-BROWN EDUCATIONAL CO.
GALION, OHIO

Phone Oakland 0489 JANITORS' SUPPLIES
Everything in HARDWARE
AT
JOHNSON'S
4236 Cottage Grove Ave.

The
Oakland :: Press
GOOD PRINTING
Invitations, Announcements, Programs, Letter Circulars, Business and Personal Stationery, etc.
3913 COTTAGE GROVE AVE.
PHONE - ATLANTIC 1876

CONSEQUENCES By JULIA ELLSWORTH FORD
Introduction by John Haynes Holmes
Nathaniel Peffer, author of China: The Collapse of a Civilization, says: Julia Ellsworth Ford makes in "Consequences" a powerful statement of the case of the Eastern peoples against Western greed and exploitation. She makes a powerful statement of the bitter truth of the opium evil, originally foisted on China by the white man for money profit. If the novel form will lead to a wider reading and appreciation of these truths, Mrs. Ford will have done a great service.
Special prices to libraries, schools, anti-narcotic societies and clubs.
Apply to Author, Rye, N. Y., E. P. Dutton and all bookshops. $1.50.

Be Yourself
A Periodical for Precarious Times
The Glass Hive—An American Group Book
(*ten times the year $2 c20 ea 4th yr*)
Edited by Will Levington Comfort, Box 33 So. Pasadena, California